

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

BRADRICK JERMAINE COLLINS,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
VS.	)	CIVIL CASE NO.
	)	
	)	3:19-CV-2433-G-BK
JAVED SYED, DIRECTOR OF	)	
COMMUNITY SUPERVISION AND	)	
CORRECTIONS,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION**  
**OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

The United States Magistrate Judge made Findings, Conclusions, and a Recommendation in this case. Petitioner filed an objection, and the Court has made a *de novo* review of those portions of the proposed findings and recommendation to which the objection was made. The objection is overruled, and the Court **ACCEPTS** the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge.

Therefore, the petition for writ of habeas corpus is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for failure to exhaust state court remedies. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b) and (c).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Petitioner is cautioned that the habeas corpus statute impose a one year statute of limitations for filing habeas corpus petitions in federal court, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d), and

Considering the record in this case and pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22(b), Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Proceedings in the United States District Court, and 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c), the Court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability. The Court adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge's Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation filed in this case in support of its finding that the petitioner has failed to show (1) that reasonable jurists would find this Court's "assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong," or (2) that reasonable jurists would find "it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right" and "debatable whether [this Court] was correct in its procedural ruling." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).<sup>2</sup>

---

that this provision is applicable to this petition as well as to any other petition that he may file in this court.

<sup>2</sup> Rule 11 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Proceedings reads as follows:

**(a) Certificate of Appealability.** The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant. Before entering the final order, the court may direct the parties to submit arguments on whether a certificate should issue. If the court issues a certificate, the court must state the specific issue or issues that satisfy the showing required by 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). If the court denies a certificate, the parties may not appeal the denial but may seek a certificate from the court of appeals under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22. A motion to reconsider a denial does not extend the time to appeal.

**(b) Time to Appeal.** Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a) governs the time to appeal an order entered under these rules. A timely notice of appeal must be filed even if the district court issues a certificate of appealability.

If petitioner files a notice of appeal,

( ) petitioner may proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal.

(X) petitioner must pay the \$505.00 appellate filing fee or submit a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

**SO ORDERED.**

February 10, 2020.

  
A. JOE FISH  
Senior United States District Judge

---